Volume XII, No. 35 HUMAN EVENTS August 27, 1955

Article Section

THE U.S. AND THE UN TODAY

By CHESLY MANLY

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S recent annual report to Congress on the United Nations expressed confidence that the "summit" conference in Geneva would "open new vistas" of opportunity for the UN, which is celebrating a 10-year nadir of achievement. The President's report seemed to assume, as the late Harry Hopkins once remarked, that the people, and Congress, too, are "just too damned dumb to understand."

Mr. Eisenhower told Congress that Guatemala was liberated from Communist rule in June, 1954, because the UN Security Council, under the leadership of Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., refused to interfere with an armed revolt by Guatemalan patriots to restore free government in their country. The truth is that the Security Council, with Lodge's support, adopted a resolution calling for an end of the anti-Communist revolution. Guatemala would be a Soviet satellite today if Colonel Castillo Armas, leader of the patriots, had not ignored the UN.

An American resolution referring the Guatemala question to the Organization of American States was killed by a Soviet veto. Then a French resolution, supported eagerly by the Kremlin's Tsarapkin and stupidly by Lodge, was adopted. It called for "the immediate termination of any action likely to cause bloodshed" and requested "all members of the United Nations to abstain . . . from rendering assistance to such action." Thus the Eisenhower Administration, elected after promising to initiate a "bold new foreign policy" for the liberation of enslaved populations from Communist tyranny, upheld a "no bloodshed" criterion for UN intervention which would prohibit any patriotic uprising anywhere in the Soviet empire.

Mr. Eisenhower declared that the "potency of the United Nations in focusing world opinion" was proved by the "limited success" of its efforts to obtain the release of American prisoners of war held by the Chinese Communists in violation of the Korean armistice agreement. The truth is that the UN resolution of December 10, 1954, condemning the spy trial and conviction of 11 American airmen as a violation of the Armistice and calling for the release of all captured personnel still detained, was contemptuously disregarded by the Chinese Communists. UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold returned empty-handed from a kow-towing mission to Peiping.

The release of four American airmen by the Chinese Communists last spring was accomplished by India's slithery V.K. Krishna Menon, who visited Peiping and announced the event in advance. On August 1, the Chinese Reds opened direct negotiations with the United States in Geneva by announcing the release of the 11 American airmen who had been sentenced as spies.

We do not know what promises Krishna Menon made to the Chinese Communists,

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nor what commitments he had from the Eisenhower Administration. Informed observers do know, however, that Communist China, within another year or so, will be admitted to the UN with only *pro forma* opposition from the United States. Possibly other Americans now rotting in Chinese jails, while Mr. Eisenhower calls for "the patience and wise self-restraint of our own people," will be released. If so they will owe their freedom to the payment of blackmail, not to the UN. The best information available, according to testimony by the executive departments before a Senate committee last April 18, is that the Communists still hold 466 American war prisoners and 40 civilians.

Adherents of the UN no longer deny the self-evident fact of its failure as a league to enforce peace, but they still foster the myth that it is an indispensable forum for the mobilization of world opinion. They cling to the UN as a bond between the United States and the Soviet Union, as a symbol of their hopes for world government. Walter Lippmann, for example, maintains that the UN should not be thought of as a league to enforce peace, but as "a universal society . . . with an increasing influence over all sovereignties and powers."

Dr. Milton Eisenhower, one of the President's closest political advisers, has repeatedly described the UN and its specialized agencies as instruments of the world government movement. Recently he wrote an adulatory foreword for a pamphlet called *UNESCO In Focus,* which declares that "for the first time in human history it is a question of world civilization or no civilization, world government, or no government." In an interview with Bela Kornitzer for an authorized biography of the Eisenhower family, the President said: "I think I would rather take Milton's views than those of anyone else." General Eisenhower himself, in his book *Crusade in Europe,* advocates "some form of limited, federated world government."

COLLECTIVISTS also regard the UN as a weapon with which they can force the United States to spend itself into socialism while financing socialist revolution in other countries. They contend that the United States has a treaty obligation, under Article 56 of the Charter, to promote the economic stability and development of other countries and must compensate for any recession that may be caused by a reduction in overseas purchases for the armaments program. President Eisenhower told the Geneva conference that "armament reduction would and should insure that part of the savings would flow into the less developed areas of the world to assist their economic development." One UN report, titled *Measures for the Economic Development of Underdeveloped Countries,* estimates that "an annual capital import in excess of 10 billion dollars" would be required to increase the per capita national income of the underdeveloped countries by 2 percent a year and that most of it would have to come from the United States.

One method of offsetting any reduction of arms spending would be Mr. Eisenhower's fantastic "atoms for peace" scheme. The President told the UN General Assembly, on December 8, 1953, that "a special purpose [of his program] would be to provide abundant electrical energy in the power starved areas of the world." Some idea of what this might cost is afforded by the plans of the Commonwealth Edison Company and its associated utilities to construct a 180,000 kilowatt nuclear plant in the Chicago area. This plan, large enough for a community of 250,000, will cost $45,000,000. At the same rate it would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cost just 72 billion dollars for the physical plant, not including the nuclear fuel, to provide "abundant electrical energy" for India alone, to say nothing of the other "power starved areas of the world."

The UN, founded upon the principle of cooperation with the Russians, can never function effectively unless they cease to be Communists. After the Russians had won a major victory in the Austrian treaty, as Miss Freda Utley reported in this section of HUMAN EVENTS on July 16, Secretary Dulles asked the country to believe that the Bolsheviks had changed their foreign policy. Speaking on a White House TV show, May 17, 1955, Mr. Dulles said: "It marks the first time that the Red armies will have turned their face in the other direction and gone back since 1945." Only 16 months earlier, the secretary had told the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee that "the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Iran" in 1946 was a "conspicuous accomplishment" of the UN.

IN HIS UN REPORT on the eve of the Geneva conference, Mr. Eisenhower pretended to discern "signs that the world may be entering a new phase in international relationships." But there were no such signs at Geneva, where the Russians disdained to conceal their aims: to prevent the rearmament of Germany, wreck the NATO alliance, and force the United States out of Europe. Mr. Eisenhower was widely acclaimed as a super-statesman, apparently because he did not give away Alaska. Actually the net result of the conference was a tremendous victory for Soviet propaganda. As reported in the *New York Times* of July 21, Mr. Eisenhower assured the conference and therefore the world that he believed "the Soviet leaders were as earnestly desirous of finding peace as their western counterparts." When India's Nehru and Krishna Menon make such statements, Americans get fighting mad, but when President Eisenhower says it he is universally applauded as the Great Pacifier.

Reading from notes taken during a conference session, the British press spokesman, Sir George Young, declared: "President Eisenhower said that all at this conference were seeking peace, not only for Europe but for the whole world. Consequently, any advance which could be made should not be dependent on anything — there should be no conditions."

It is no wonder that Khrushchev, Bulganin, Molotov and Zhukov seemed to be laughing every time the press photographers took their pictures. It appeared for a time that Mr. Eisenhower possessed a secret weapon, that the Russians would die laughing at his diplomacy by enchantment.

The shocking spectacle of an American President fawning upon these grinning assassins in an orgy of camaraderie and fraternization apparently caused little if any popular revulsion in this country. If President Roosevelt had courted Hitler in such an obsequious manner, the Liberals, quite justifiably, would have destroyed him.

IT SHOULD BE OBVIOUS to every adult American with a political IQ no lower than his age that the Bolsheviks regard diplomatic negotiations as war by other means. They negotiate to gain time, to divide their enemies, to obtain a propaganda advantage, or to win concessions. They know, as Stalin wrote, that in revolutionary warfare, it is sometimes expedient to substitute for offensive tactics "the tactics of temporary retreat, the tactics of flanking movements." They are mindful of Lenin's dictum that a revolutionist must be ready, when necessary, to "maneuver," to "temporize and compromise," to "move in zigzags," to "abandon the course once selected and to try others." They love peace. "The conqueror," said Clausewitz,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"is always a lover of peace; he would like to make his entry into our state unopposed." As Stalin wrote, they accept "reforms in general, and compromises and agreements in particular," only as a "cover" for "illegal work."

Yet the American people are constantly told by the official and journalistic haruspices that a regime whose foreign minister is V. M. Molotov, an Old Bolshevik associate of Lenin and Stalin, may change its ways. For example, Marquis Childs wrote from Geneva that the conference might be "the beginning of some small degree of mutual confidence . . . which may ultimately bring peace." If there is any single cause of the world's present plight, it is confidence — confidence on the part of American officials, newspaper editors and columnists that the Bolsheviks will cease to be Communists, and confidence on the part of the Russians, that our leaders will *not* cease to be idiots.

George Sokolsky opined that "if peace does not come after this four-power conference there can be little hope for peace in our times." He proposed a formal treaty with the Russians, as if the UN Charter did not exist. Later he interpreted the Soviet cry for co-existence as "a retreat from Marx, Lenin and Stalin." Lenin and Stalin, of course, were archetypal co-existers. In 1927, Stalin declared: "We cannot forget the saying of Lenin to the effect that a great deal in the matter of our construction depends on whether we succeed in delaying war with the capitalist countries, which is inevitable, but which may be delayed either until proletarian revolution ripens in Europe, or until the colonial revolution comes fully to a head, or, finally, until the capitalists fight among themselves. . . . Therefore the maintenance of peaceful relations with capitalist countries is an obligatory task for us. The basis of our relations with capitalist countries consists in admitting the co-existence of two opposed systems."

Stalin reaffirmed that doctrine only a few months before he died, before the Nineteenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party, in October, 1952.

Dr. Marek Stanislaw Korowicz, who broke away from the UN delegation of Communist Poland in 1953, correctly declared that "the greatest defeat short of war for the Communists would be the loss of diplomatic relations with the west." We should sever relations with the Bolshevik Government and get out of the UN, not because it is a self-evident futility but because it aids the Communist conspiracy. That is why the Communists are in it. We do not have to choose between "peaceful co-existence" and war. A third alternative is non-acceptance. As a nation we have no more obligation, indeed no more sanction under the laws of nature and nature's God, to accept the fellowship of the Bolsheviks than a Christian church has to admit impenitent atheists and murderers.

Chesly Manly is the author of the definitive study of the New Deal: *The Twenty Year Revolution.* He last wrote for HUMAN EVENTS on May 28, 1955, "Kohler of Kohler: Reuther Has Lost a 14-Month-Old Strike."

A brilliant new book by Mr. Manly entitled "*The Story of the UN: Ten Fateful Years for America*" will come off the press in October. An autographed copy will be reserved for you if you will mail the bookstore price ($3.95) to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Buy copies for your library, teachers and professors and for your friends.

Additional copies of the 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30.
In quantities of 5,000 or more, $20 per thousand.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. $10 per year. **Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XII, No. 35 Saturday, August 27, 1955 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Hutchins: Robert M. Hutchins, President of the Ford Fund for the Republic, has announced that the Fund is making a $25,000 grant to the School of Law of Stanford University for the study and analysis of the testimony of leading witnesses on Communism before congressional investigating committees.

Staff members of the congressional investigating committees take exception, not to the grant or to the Stanford Law School, but to the statements by Hutchins accompanying the announcement.

Despite the fact that Hutchins — so far as they know — has never read the testimony given to the congressional committees, he pronounced this verdict: "The evidence offered to point to a man as a danger to American institutions has often been farcically remote."

Hutchins' sympathetic attitude toward Communists is well documented by Professor E. Merrill Root of Earlham College in his forthcoming book (for October release) *Collectivism on the Campus.** As told in the book:

When Hutchins was testifying in 1949 under oath before the Illinois Seditious Activities Investigation Commission inquiry into subversive activities at the University of Chicago of which he was then chancellor, he was asked:

"The records show that some sixty-odd persons listed in the latest available directory of the University of Chicago as professors or professors emeritus have been affiliated with 135 Communist-front organizations in 465 separate affiliations. Is that not something for which the university might well be alarmed?"

Hutchins: "I don't see why."

Question: "Do you consider that the Communist Party in the United States comes within the scope of a clear and present danger?"

Hutchins: "I don't think so."

Question: "Are you aware that the Communist-front organization is a part of the Communist movement just as much as the Party itself?"

Hutchins: "No."

Question: "You haven't attempted to make a study of the Communist Party?"

Hutchins: "No, I haven't . . ."

Question: "Is there any doubt that the Communist Party is a conspiratorial Fifth Column operated in the interests of a foreign state?"

"I am not instructed on the subject . . . ," Hutchins answered.

Another statement by Hutchins: "It is not yet established that it is subversive to be a Communist." And still another: "As a matter of fact, I have never been able to find a Red professor."

Because of the last statement, Hutchins was queried at some length about several members of his faculty. One of them was Dr. Oscar Lange, a Pole who entered the United States in 1937 and became professor of economics at Chicago University. In 1945, Lange returned to Communist-dominated Poland, became foreign minister and declared that America was his enemy. Nevertheless, he was listed in the catalog of the University of Chicago for another year as a member of the faculty "on leave of absence."

The Illinois Senate Committee asked: "In view of this, would Professor Lange be received back at the University of Chicago . . . ?"

Hutchins: "I am not acquainted with Professor Lange's present views. If his views are now what they were when he went on leave of absence . . .

Collectivism on the Campus can be bought from HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. by sending us the retail price ($5). Delivery in October.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he would be welcome back. I don't know if his views are different now."

Question: "Do you recall that he made a statement renouncing the United States?"

Hutchins: "I do."

Question: "But he will be taken back, as a professor at the University of Chicago, if he still desires, is that right, even though he is an objector to this form of government?"

Hutchins: "This certain policy is the same to which many loyal Americans objected."

Professor Root's book shows that Lange made no secret of his pro-Communist views while he was at the University of Chicago. In 1944, Professor Lange co-authored a pamphlet attacking free enterprise and proposing complete socialism for the United States. The booklet, by the way, was sponsored by the National Education Association for distribution as a guide to secondary school principals!

Reds In Radio: "Exhibit A" among the 27 entertainment industry personages to appear at the hearings recently held in New York by the House Un-American Activities Committee was Tony Kraber, previously named by ace playwright Clifford Odets and ace stage-screen director Elia Kazan as a fellow-member of a Manhattan Communist cell in the Thirties. Kraber pleaded self-incrimination to all questions about Communist membership, but he could not conceal his eagerness to tell about the power he had wielded in the broadcasting industry. He boasted that he was accustomed to hiring "hundreds and hundreds of actors" while handling a CBS budget of $100,000 a week.

During the war, he had been CBS director of short-wave programs. Later he became a CBS executive producer and in 1951 became special events director. He has also been program director for the DuMont network.

"Exhibit B" among the Fifth Amendment witnesses was Ivan Black, who — not surprisingly — was director of information for the Federal Theatre in WPA days. After that, he started a public relations firm for stage, screen and radio clients. So magical was his influence with producers and directors that in the mid-Forties he was voted "the No. 1 starmaker" in a magazine poll of 600 editors.

Anti-Communists in show business have long contended that blacklisting of actors was the invention of the Communists. From the mid-Thirties until June 25, 1950 (when the Korean war broke out) an actor in Hollywood or New York was courting oblivion if he became active in the fight against Communism — unless his fan following was so great that it would not be ignored.

Only recently has there been a mild and relatively ineffective counterattack — based upon the principle that when two actors apply for a part, other things being equal, is there anything wrong with choosing the one whose Americanism cannot be challenged?

Quotes of the Week: (1) Baruch: "Only the guilty have any reason to fear congressional inquiries into Communism."

(2) Pink: "How could an actor — even a deluded actor — hurt this country?"

Red, White and Blue: "Ever read what happened to Abe Lincoln?"

Republican Liberals Plan Coup: The Dewey-Adams-Javits-Shanley-Stassen faction of the GOP has begun its drive to gain control of the Party after 1956. Thomas E. Stephens, long-time Dewey aide in New York State and former appointments secretary to the President, is in charge, reporting directly to Sherman Adams in the White House.

Stephens' first assignment is to provide for the contingency, remote though it may be, that the President will not run for a second term. Contacting GOP leaders throughout the country, he is offering them all the inducements at the command of the Administration if they will agree to work exclusively for the selection of "Republican liberals" as delegates to the 1956 convention. The object is to nominate, if not Dewey himself, Chief Justice Earl Warren or a reasonable facsimile thereof. Nixon — only if the President insists.

Stephens' second assignment — as described by Joseph Alsop in his column — is at the same time to promote the candidacy for state and national offices of "superior" persons (of liberal com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plexion, of course). Alsop says that "national political organizations" have rarely assumed this responsibility; "usually natural selection is left to operate, *quite often with unfortunate results.*" (Our emphasis.) The second assignment has infuriated orthodox Republicans who thought the policy of Presidential dictation of the choice of candidates — attempted by FDR — was a characteristic of the New Deal and not of the Republican Party. They assert with much indignation that it is the practice in the Soviet Union, not in the United States, for the "national political organization" to pick the candidates that the people will be allowed to "vote" for, Communists also justifying the system with the Alsopian argument that it provides "superior" candidates.

Reaction to the Stephens mission was instantaneous in two states. Republicans in New York and New Jersey remembered that the Palace Guard persuaded the President to indicate that his two favorites among all the candidates for office in 1954 were Jacob Javits, who ran for attorney-general in New York, and Clifford Case, who ran for the Senate in New Jersey. When these two men were in the House of Representatives, they called themselves Republicans, but their votes on controversial issues were 70 percent with the Democrats and 30 percent with the Republicans.

The Dewey faction argues that "the conservative wing has nowhere else to go," but a Taft-Republican group in these two states is hoping to prove differently with this message: "To all good Republicans: A known enemy in the open is better than a false friend in ambush. In 1956, defeat Eisenhower even if you elect Stevenson."

Foreign Aid: "Foreign aid cannot be terminated until from three to five years after the date on which the President gives a firm and convincing order to the International Cooperation Administration that no more foreign aid commitments of any kind can be entered into." This statement was made by a member of the Hoover Commission visiting HUMAN EVENTS office this week.

The reason, explained our caller, is that overseas projects which have been begun or authorized as a result of promises made to foreign countries in the name of the U.S. Government would compel continuation for a three to five year period. New promises are being made every day by officers of the agency as a means of perpetuating the foreign aid program and safeguarding their own jobs.

Another visitor to the HUMAN EVENTS office, an American just returned from Ankara, Turkey, described the effects of the moral commitments that have been made to that country. The Turkish people who have been friendlier to America than any other people except perhaps the Greeks, are today in an increasingly hostile mood, he asserted. A few weeks ago Turkey asked us for a loan of $300,000,000 but instead was offered $30,000,000. American officials justified the refusal by saying that Turkey has over-extended its industrial construction. Inflation is approaching the danger point. Readjustment downward is called for.

But — said our visitor who talked to the top Turkish officials — the Turks replied: "Who insisted that we embark upon this over-ambitious program? Not us, but your American foreign aid officials! Our representatives insisted that we were not ready for some of the projects proposed; we said others were uneconomic. But we were told that you Americans know far better than we what we ought to have. We were tartly told to accept your 'suggestions' — or do without American aid."

Labor Front: Announcing the settlement between the United Mine Workers and the northern bituminous coal operators, John L. Lewis could not resist the opportunity to indicate his contempt — without mentioning names — for "rah-rah boy" Reuther. The statement included this Lewis-like comment: "The settlement is devoid of Marxian babble and contains no wind or water."

Voice: The Voice of America became the Voice of the Soviet Union on August 24, 1955 when the Soviet Acting Minister of Agriculture used its facilities to broadcast to the Soviet people. At the suggestion of USIA chief Streibert, the impressions of Vladimir Matskevich, head of the Russian farm delegation, were recorded at the Soviet Embassy in Washington for transmission to Iron Curtain peoples.

Several congressmen have said they intend to ask why U.S. taxpayers should spend $100 million a year on USIA — if the cold war is over.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

George — Talmadge — Arnall: Senator Walter George, 78, is undecided as to whether to run for re-election to the Senate where he has served since 1922. Herman Talmadge (governor 1948-54) is seeking to persuade him "to retire honorably," hinting that he will enter the race regardless of the Senator's decision. But George backers claim "young Hummun" is bluffing. Does the ex-governor really think the voters will exchange the more powerful man in the Senate for one who, however able, would have to start at the bottom? Furthermore, they cannot believe Talmadge would chance defeat now when probably, by waiting only a few years longer, he would get the seat by appointment, the governor being a Talmadge man.

The Senator, who is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is being pressured by the White House to run. The President is accused of listening more intently to the Senator on matters of foreign relations than to his Secretary of State. George — even more than the President who certainly is receptive — thinks the new Soviet regime sincerely believes in peaceful co-existence. Secretary Dulles, on the other hand, is dubious. In addition, the White House is worried about the outspoken isolationism of Talmadge who hopes to become the Senate symbol of bitter-end hostility to the entire foreign aid program.

If George would retire, Ellis Arnall (governor 1943-47) would jump in feet-first. A contest between Arnall and Talmadge — two "dreamboat" candidates — would be Georgia's "Battle of the Century." Each has been described as the ablest representative in the entire South of his wing of the Democratic Party. Each is claimed to call 20,000 or more Georgia voters by their first names.

Arnall has spent much of his time, since leaving the governorship, in Hollywood, New York and Washington. During the day, he was attorney for motion picture interests. During the evening, he was a social lion among ADA-type intellectuals. But now he is spending more time in Georgia.

Georgia political editors think Talmadge would carry the white precincts by 3 to 2 or better, so Arnall's chances would depend upon how successfully his forces could maximize the Negro vote — without appearing to do so. Negroes constitute 30 percent of the state's population and before many more years, will be the decisive vote, since they tend to vote as a unit and the whites do not. But as of now, they vote in substantial numbers only in the cities, not in the rural precincts where most of them live. In some rural counties, they compose 70 to 80 percent of the population, but there the whites have so far been successful in "discouraging" Negro voting. Arnall's northern supporters have promised him ample financial backing, but their contributions will be channelled almost exclusively to Negro organizations, like the NAACP for the purpose of building up the Negro vote.

Talmadge reacts violently to charges that he is anti-Negro; he denies ever having used the phrase "white supremacy." He claims to be opposed to "mongrelization." The two races, he says, should and can live amicably alongside each other. He points out that during his governorship, appropriations for Negro schools, for agricultural aid programs and for back-country roads (helping Negroes particularly) mounted to several times the sums of previous years.

If both George and Talmadge run, Arnall — having waited impatiently for eight years — may enter, too, believing his solid liberal-Negro support could win against the split conservative forces.

The New Dealish Atlanta dailies — both owned by former Democratic presidential nominee James M. Cox of Dayton, Ohio — prefer George, but would favor Arnall to Talmadge.

Letter from GEORGE MURPHY, Star of Stage and Screen, a pioneer in the long and bitter fight against Communism in Hollywood: "I have been a subscriber and reader of HUMAN EVENTS for the past several years and find it to be one of the most enlightening and interesting publications."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section.
Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. **Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. 1954 volume now ready.**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED